

HUMAN RELATIONS IN EMPLOYMENT PRACTICES

Conference on Civil Rights
 United Steelworkers Committee on Civil Rights
 University of Indiana
 Bloomington, Indiana - June 20, 1960.

The topic assigned to me has very broad implications, subject to a particular definition of "Human Relations" determined largely by one's experience and interests. It could be made to include labor-management relations or the strictly inter-personal relations in a job situation. For fairly obvious reasons, however, I have taken the liberty of confining myself to the limited definition of Human Relations in Employment Practices as affecting the civil rights aspects of the right to employment, or the right to compete for employment.

It has been said that the works of most writers, of fiction particularly, are largely biographical, in that the characters and situations are those growing out of the personal experiences of the writer, however much they may be embellished or enlarged upon by one's imagination. In a sense, this applies also to my paper today, in that the principle part of my observations, reports and conclusions, while definitely not to be considered as fiction, have been part and parcel of my own life and work experiences. These experiences have been confined, during my adult years, to that area of employment relations that is the most contradictory, inefficient, wasteful and costly luxury to be found in our economic system, namely, practices of discrimination in the employment of persons because of race, color, creed, national origin, age and sex.

My initial exposure to such practices came to me after a brief, sheltered and colorful dream-state, followed by a rude awakening. From the moment of that awakening until the present day, every step of the way along the employment path, my own employment and the employment of those who would be my clients, have acquainted me with devious practices which are employed as a continuing rejection and denial of our commitment to democracy and our free, competitive, economic system. In my own work

DEC 6 1973

Free Public Library, Newark, N. J.

N. J. REFERENCE DIVISION - LD

experience ranging from porter, car-washer and chauffeur to agency executive and state law enforcement officer, as well as in observing the experiences of tens of thousands of other American workers, I have been privileged to examine methods used to deprive individuals of their basic right to compete.

Implied in this last statement is my firm belief that the supreme test of the integrity of a free enterprise system, is the amount and kind of protection afforded *the least favored among us, to compete freely and fairly with the most fortunate of us* - for jobs and wages as well as for business and profits; between individuals offering their skills and experiences, as well as between corporations purveying goods and services.

It is true that Democracy has not attained full stature, nor has our competitive system evolved all of its necessary checks and balances. It is conceivable that neither of these goals will ever fully be attained. Like the will-o'-the-wisp, as we seem to draw near, they continue to elude us and to beckon us on from afar. Yet, if we review even briefly the record of our quest for democracy in employment relations, our progress has been impressive.

For instance, it was completely natural that the more recent waves of the immigrant labor army to arrive upon these shores, beginning a century ago and continuing through the years since, would be bequeathed those jobs others scorned; but it would not have been natural to confine their sons, through all successive generations, to those onerous tasks. Because of our ability to embrace these new peoples and their several cultures, America has prospered and grown strong through the contributions of brain, brawn and spirit made by the many peoples of the world who are American today. It was equally a natural course of events that slave labor would be used by greedy and unprincipled owners, to compete unfairly against free white labor of the South, depriving it of its rightful claim to public works. It could be expected that this would create deep hostility on the part of white labor against a system which permitted such unfair competition; but it was not and is not natural for such hostility to have been turned upon the ignorant and hapless victims of exploitation, and upon their sons for all succeeding generations.

Yet, it has been this unnatural history of labor relations' development that a century later continues to weaken labor organization and to inflict great social and economic cost upon all of society.

The history of American labor runs parallel to, even though distinct from, the evolution of the American phenomenon of intergroup prejudice. I do not mean by this that labor, or even laboring men per se, were the creators or disseminators of group prejudice. Neither do I absolve them completely from playing a responsible role in its development. I do say that there were natural forces operating during our growth as an industrial nation which enabled group prejudice to sprout like noxious weeds in an unsaltivated garden - even in labor's garden.

For group prejudice is a combination of elements, which appear in the unsaltivated mind and the undisciplined society. It is first, the impact upon individual attitudes of the negative influences of Habit or Custom in a community climate, which serves to deprive minorities of their rights to dignity and self-respect because of the accident of birth. The thoughtless, selfish taking on of personal habit or social custom in practicing discrimination; the yielding to conformity in adopting unfair, discriminatory practices, by any man, mark the initial entrance of the germ of intolerance in his own system of values. He may start out with no ill-feeling against an individual or group, but with the single, selfish motivation to take advantage of the other's weakness; but the habit of exploiting individuals of the weaker group, ultimately finds justification for this unfairness through a process of depriving them, first, of status; then of rights. This is the genesis of the habit of prejudiced behavior.

The second element, Fear - fear of job displacement through competition; fear of loss of social position, of political control, of economic security - is another influence upon one's feelings and thoughts. Emotional insecurity prompts the fearful individual to seek a scapegoat who invariably is the most highly visible, so-called

"different" group of newer people in the community. Add to these elements of Habit and Fear, the influence of Miseducation and Misinformation, usually acquired through the affect of lurid, frightening, inflammatory statement and insidious rumor; and then include the fourth element Exploitation which¹ perpetrated by those who profit by group division, and we have all the forces which create intergroup tension and conflict - in a plant, union hall, neighborhood or city.

The first three of these elements, Habit, Fear and Miseducation, have accompanied in parallel lines every step in the gradual growth of the Labor movement; they have influenced this growth positively, and its lack of growth negatively; and in turn have been influenced by Labor development. The Labor movement in the Steel industry, as was the case in Coal also, experienced great travail during the period that exploiting employers imported Southern Negroes as strikebreakers at the turn of the century. These acts created open conflict and deep hostilities as negative results at the time, and for many years thereafter, but they also reacted positively and creatively in producing intelligent, farsighted, courageous union leadership who saw that no man in labor could truly be protected unless all men were protected. Thus did some of the darkest days in American labor history produce great light.

We know, of course, that not all of Labor has reached this enlightened state. There still are those leaders in Craft unionism, and their rank and file members who, applying the principle of labor scarcity operating as a bargaining lever, exclude entire segments of the population from the entering threshold of their crafts. The recently published report of a study by Industrial Relations Counsellors,⁽¹⁾ in commenting upon local union practices of discrimination, says:

"In the Construction industry, many of the unions have defacto closed shop arrangements with employers, despite the prohibition of the closed shop in the Taft-Hartley Act. Similar practices are in effect in many printing plants, machine shops and other establishments where the contracting unions exclude Negroes and thus debar them from employment in the several trades. In such situations" the report continues, ".....(this) not only restricts employer access to

(1) "Employing the Negro in American Industry", 1959, Industrial Relations Counsellors, Inc., New York.

Negro manpower in filling skilled jobs, but also prevents Negroes from obtaining the apprentice training necessary to qualify for such jobs."

---but more of this later.

In addition to such practices in Craft unionism, there are, too, the backward state and local leaders of industrial unionism, and their rank-and-file production workers, North and South, who repudiate national and international policies and principles by applying differentials in treatment to unwanted, easily exploited, minorities. Separate seniority rosters for Negroes and whites, separate lines of job progression, and denial of Negro representation on union policy boards and in elective and appointive positions, are just some of the abuses recently alluded to by A. Philip Randolph in the document which may one day be referred to as Negro labor's Declaration of Independence: his keynote speech in the formation of a Negro American Labor Council.

Similar contradictions in the operational practices of many employers in all parts of the country further demonstrate the startling degree to which otherwise intelligent and decently motivated people can descend to the cultural level of primitive man. In this, our enlightened age, we have come full circle in that the more or less natural impulses in establishing employment practices, years ago, set in motion certain Habits, Customs and Fears - some use the word "Tradition" - which in turn serve today to justify continuation of these practices, despite our moral convictions, ethical considerations and legal edicts to the contrary.

In more than three decades of acquaintance with employment practices, from the false prosperity of the gay '20's, through the Dismal '30s and war-torn '40s to the present, it has been possible to classify the many roadblocks thrown up by labor and management to impede the progress of minority group job-seekers and workers.

First of these, and once the most prevalent practice, was that of total exclusion of all members of particular groups. The observable fact today that this practice is rare, in most sections of the country, often gives false comfort to the uninitiated

who will have considered this to be the total problem of minority group employment. In most states of the union, it is improbable that a condition would be found today that was disclosed by a study done in New Jersey in 1936. Of 1867 industries included in that inquiry, 55% of them employed not a single Negro worker in any capacity. The 45% remaining, with but few exceptions, employed Negro workers by limiting them to unskilled, low-wage, distasteful tasks. Of over 200,000 employed persons embraced in the study, Negro workers were but 3.6% of all the gainfully employed, although representing 5.5% of the state population. Through records of the Emergency Relief Administration and the State Department of Institutions and Agencies, who sponsored the study, it was disclosed that this 5½% of the state population, the Negro, constituted 25% of the relief load of the state, the direct and measurable result of unemployment and underemployment of a single ethnic group. In terms of dollar cost, these same records showed that State and Federal governments were paying \$28 million per year to support in idleness the workers of a racial group, - whose inability to produce for self-support was created by the discrimination practices by some employers and labor union leaders.

It is true that this study was done during the depths of the Depression of the '30s when unemployment was widespread; but the great racial disproportion disclosed, served to emphasize the helplessness of any group of American citizens, who because of the accident of birth, is deprived of protection in their basic right to compete for employment on merit and seniority alone.

Recent studies reveal that, whatever gains may have been made against practices of total exclusion, there are observable examples of devices employed to exclude minority group workers from particular job levels and classifications according to prejudices of employers and their agents. There was, for instance, the study of white-collar job placements in Chicago,^{2/} in which 30,000 placement orders were examined. Of this total, 20% placed restrictions against Jews, Catholics and

^{2/}From a study by the Bureau of Jewish Employment Problems, Chicago.

persons of various nationality groups; while 98% excluded non-whites. A further inquiry was made of the actual employment practices of 100 firms whose job orders made no discriminatory demands or restrictions as disclosed by the original inquiry. Even though they had refrained from making discriminatory specifications in job orders, forty-seven of the 100 firms refused to hire members of these same minorities in white collar jobs.

In a study conducted in 1958 for the Fund for the Republic,^{2/} it was revealed that four international unions of a total of 70 studied, still carried discriminatory clauses in their constitutions which limited membership to white persons only. These were in the Railroad Brotherhood. However, in nine international unions there were found constitutional requirements for "fraternal approval" of an applicant, which of course opened the door for the black-ball method of exclusion, even if and when persons were able to get past the first hurdle of having a sponsor for membership from within the organization. This kind of research, obviously, could not ferret out the methods used in month-to-month operations of thousands of local unions which see fit to ignore the non-discriminatory policies of parent, international bodies. One case in point has been the much-publicized exclusion of Negro electricians from the great amount of public work available in the national capital.

Although practices of total exclusion are not found in numerous instances today, various methods are used by employers, unions and their agents, to maintain a discriminatory limitation on the number or quality of job assignment of minority group workers. Investigations by state regulatory agencies have exposed these practices in the course of processing complaints. Most common among these is the widely-used practice of maintaining job-ceilings for minority groups workers - the arbitrary fixing of limits of skill, status and wage, beyond which a minority group person may not climb. These workers may be used in comparatively large numbers in some instances, but are

^{2/}"Economic Situation of Negroes in the U.S.", April '60 report, U.S. Dept. of Labor.

confined to menial, unskilled, low-paying and distasteful tasks exclusively, regardless of their training, experience or length of service with an employer. The universal reason given in support of this practice is that the minority in question has no workers who can qualify for higher positions. With the burden of proof placed upon the rejected worker or the group he represents, there is no influence through which this practice may be challenged other than that of a vigilant labor organization or a government regulatory agency having enforcement powers. It is believed that a considerable number of firms are following this plan, in many instances with the apparent knowledge and collaboration of unions with whom they have contracts.

The second most prevalent practice is that of token placement of one or very few workers of the particular minority group, oftentimes placing these persons in highly visible locations, but thereafter excluding any other applicants from the group, however well qualified they may be. The chosen showpieces are thus presented as evidence of a non-discriminatory policy in the plant or business, with personnel office maintaining tight control of the exclusionary policy. Here again, only an alert union organization and/or an enforcement agency of government processing active complaints, can detect and alter this practice.

Where discriminatory policies exist, differing methods of implementing the policy are used. For instance, a differential in the standards employed in the selection of workers will place much more rigorous demands for schooling or prior experience upon members of minorities, than upon others, thereby reducing the number of such groups who are able to pass into the work force. There are instances on record where, in local and state government positions, for instance, under the supposed protection of civil service regulations, all Negroes were excluded because of the supposed racial predilection to flat feet, or to cycle-sell sensitis, whether or not these conditions actually existed or were pertinent to the job situation.

Differentials in selection standards as an intake regulator, and arbitrary and summary discharge, on first offense or slight provocation, are methods freely employed against minority groupworkers as means of maintaining what an employer or union leader may consider to be a "safe" number or ratio of such workers in a plant situation.

Even when there is available evidence suggesting that this numerical control is not being exercised, other restricting, discriminatory practices may be in vogue, such as the discouraging routine of assigning minorities to the more distasteful, unwanted tasks, and depriving them of promotional rights by which escape from these tasks may be expected with meritorious work performance. Equally discouraging to the worker, is lack of access to effective grievance machinery. Prevalence of these injustices has been responsible for a large part of the high turnover record attributed to minority group workers. It has been my duty a number of times in past years, to investigate situations involving summary discharge of minority group workers, whose appeals from action of the foreman were rejected on union recommendation. In each case, the Negro or Puerto Rican worker had been by-passed in promotion, or had been needled and mistreated by fellow-workers, then ignored by his union officers after he had been clobbered into temporary loss of emotional control. Only through State intervention were their cases thoroughly investigated and their basic rights secured.

There is comparatively little discussion given to practices which tend to exclude minority group workers from plant or union leisure-time and recreational activities. In one celebrated case in New Jersey, a few years ago, Negroes were not permitted to enter a plant bowling league, thus supporting and giving strength to practices of excluding Negroes from public bowling alleys in the entire community, and to the then prevailing discriminatory policy of the American Bowling Congress. It was the New Jersey Division against Discrimination, the New Jersey CIO Council, and labor unions throughout the nation, who cooperatively took up the cudgel and ultimately battered down this form of discrimination. Another New Jersey FEPC complaint situation

found Negroes confined to certain job levels, encouraged by white workers in the plant who did not want Negroes involved in any way with their golfing, fishing, baseball and other extra-curricular activities. Their attitudes had influenced the Company in maintaining separate locker facilities, and separate job classifications for Negroes, even though Negro and white worked shoulder to shoulder in several of the departments.

Conditions such as these have been justified by their perpetrators as having no relevance to conditions of work, and as being of purely a social nature and one of voluntary association where one has the right to discriminate. No thoughtful person can dismiss the gravity of impact such practices can make upon the man-to-man working relationships of persons exposed to such forms of differentiation and demarcation.

The issue of Jim Crow unions was brought to a head in the recent National Executive Council meeting, when Philip Randolph and George Meany clashed on this subject. Here, too, our New Jersey experience has given us opportunity to observe the workings of separate unions. Building construction laborers in Northern New Jersey, and elsewhere, have been assigned jobs on a racial basis, with white locals appropriating the bigger, better, longer construction jobs for their men, leaving the short, temporary, sporadic operations to the Negro. The 'longshoremen on the New York-New Jersey waterfront and the sand-hogs in Hudson and East River tunnel work have observed similar practices. Whether we attribute the poor distribution of jobs to the personal, political commitments of steward or business agent, the end result is the same, namely, the discriminatory selection of workers from what is supposed to be a fair, democratic shape-up. There is as much or as little validity and truth to the claim that racially separate locals are good union policy, as there is to the now completely discredited claim that "separate but equal" schools are the answers to the educational problems of the South.

This statement loses none of its validity or integrity by acknowledgment that

there are Negro unionists who prefer separate locals. What have not been examined are first, the natural, though frequently questionable, tendencies of salaried union officers in these segregated locals, as elsewhere, to protect their vested interests; and secondly, the background for the real fears of Negro unionists that their interests will not be protected nor their grievances heard, if they are deprived of representation by their own racial spokesmen. The inner core of labor union leadership must give recognition to the implications behind these two valid reasons some Negroes may entertain for supporting segregation in union organization. It has been the painful experiences of Negro unionists all over the nation which have prompted the formation of a Negro American Labor Council with which to isolate, expose and eliminate practices that have created this fear.

Of the many discriminatory practices to which minority group workers are exposed one of the most insidious in its long-range effect is the withholding of preparation and incentive which accrue from formal and informal training and apprenticeship programs. Ginsberg ^{b/} discusses the handicaps to education imposed by the inferior school facilities available to Negroes. Relating this to preparation for the job, the author says:

"Poor preparation is not the only reason why the Negro has encountered serious difficulty in breaking into the area of skilled work, but it does add to the obstacles created by racial discrimination. The informal route to skilled and supervisory work, therefore, is a rocky road for the young Negro. On the formal route, through apprenticeship training" he continues, "his obstacles are perhaps even greater In spite of the important gains the Negro has made outside the South in recent years, his progress has been slow in the case of apprenticeship training."

In his recent study of this area of concern, Hill ^{c/} quotes several researchers and government agencies, in documenting his report of the nature and extent of discrimination against Negroes, in apprenticeship opportunities in the building trades, metal trades, structural ironwork, in industrial training courses and in GI Bill

^{b/}Ginsberg, Eli; The Negro Potential, Columbia University Press. 1958. p. 105

^{c/}Hill, Herbert; The Negro Wage Earner and Apprenticeship Training Programs, NAACP, 1960.

apprentice-training. He says, in part:

"Kush indicates (in a 1959 study) that less than 1% of the construction apprentices are Negro, confirming thereby an earlier Urban League study of the absence of apprenticeship opportunity for the Negro in the building trades of Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Cleveland and Detroit, among other large urban areas. A recent study in San Francisco, Hill continues, "revealed that Negroes were not indentured by the responsible apprenticeship parties in the electrical, plumbing and carpentry apprenticeship programs in that city, and that only one Negro had served as an apprentice in the metal trades."

Hill's report goes on to name structural iron, sheet metal, lathing and tile setting; electrical, plumbing and needle trades, as well as railroad crafts and hotel trades, in such widely separated sections of the country as Michigan, Connecticut, Indiana, Kentucky, Tennessee, Alabama, New Jersey and New York, as giving research evidence of the exclusion of Negro youth from training opportunity.

In 16 State FEPC agencies having enforceable laws against discrimination, not to mention several municipal agencies having similar powers, almost unlimited research material is accumulating through which to measure the nature and incidence of employment discrimination. Although collectively they represent approximately 130 administrative years of enforcement experience, no one of them can claim possession of the magic formula wherewith to eradicate the evil growing out of group prejudice. Neither are they going out of business for lack of work! Actually, case-loads show no appreciable decline, and the ratio of justified complaints found in the total cases closed ranges from approximately 20% in the lowest to 50% in the highest, signifying a continuing battle with discrimination in employment. I can say without fear of successful contradiction, however, that the number and proportion of complaints processed against labor unions are extremely low in each of the jurisdictions whose reports I have studied.

This encouraging fact does not absolve labor from its weighty responsibility, first in protecting itself, and secondly in protecting our country from the debili-

tating effect of discrimination. Emphasis is placed upon these two dimensions because of the almost universal habit of thinking that anti-discrimination efforts are designed for the benefit of the minority group only. On the contrary, many examples have been exposed wherein active collaboration with employers, or passive acceptance of their unfair practices, have involved labor leadership in immoral and unethical commitments, even though technically they may not have violated a law. The confidence of individuals with whom they deal, however, white as well as Negro, will have been exposed to slow, certain dry-rot where such practices prevail, and cynicism takes the place of confidence and conviction, these being the bedrock of effective unionism.

Management has designed a new slogan to fit an old program - "Right to Work" legislation. Whatever may be the truth of arguments being used to support or oppose this legislative drive, one dangerous implication seems to me to stand in the background as a looming threat to labor peace. In communities and states where Labor, through sins of omission, has cynically permitted racial, religious and nationality prejudices to operate against large segments of the population, we may reasonably expect that Right to Work campaigns, again as in the Steel and Coal situations of half a century ago, will exploit minority groups needs and dissatisfactions if for no other reason than to weaken labor's bargaining power. As a Negro who for over 25 years has worked untiringly to help rid Negro workers of their painfully acquired fear of unionism, I dread even the thought that this new device could be used to put to trial the Negro's hunger for occupational opportunity, his patience and forbearance in coping with intolerance, his only recently-formed belief in the principle of labor solidarity.

Labor cannot afford to indulge in philosophic, emotionally satisfying but program-retarding pursuit of debating which is better: Legislative or educational methods of combatting discrimination. (The simple fact of the matter, amply demonstrated, is that both are essential for reasonably prompt and efficient correction of an evil).

Neither may positive action be avoided or delayed by pointing the finger of blame to the divided opinions, the irritating militancy, the confusion and the frustration demonstrated by Negro leadership in its several roles and levels of operation. All these manifestations are natural results of their experiences -- as natural as is the disagreement and confusion of white leadership in international relationships or in domestic, Labor-Management relations -- It can be expected that these conditions will grow worse before they become better, unless in the meantime Labor vigorously attacks the problems which create this unrest, and attacks them on all fronts.

Always, in discussions of human relations problems, the ultimate question is asked "What can we do about it?" No one person dares presume that he can supply the answers, human nature being as perverse as it often is. I may attempt some answers, but first, let me suggest several proposals on the subject presented by two eminent men of Labor: Harry Fleischman of the National Labor Service, and A. Philip Randolph, vice-president of AFL-CIO. In a recent article appearing in the New Leader, ^{6/}Fleischman proposes that the Executive Council of AFL-CIO should:

1. Make regular surveys of the civil rights practices of all unions;
2. Develop machinery for initiating investigations and carrying out compliance, processes, even where no formal complaint is forthcoming;
3. Coordinate the presently scattered and diffused civil rights activities of local, state, national and international unions, with those of intergroup agencies;
4. Put civil rights higher on the action list of labor; make a passion of this job instead of a part-time process;
5. Step up civil rights education in all unions through Educational Directors and Editors;
6. Above all, cooperate with intergroup relations agencies in all phases of anti-discrimination work.

Philip Randolph, confining his proposals to the inner workings of labor organization, ^{7/}proposes:

1. That greater effort be made toward the education in unionism, of Negro workers and unionists;

^{6/}New Leader, April 18, 1960, p. 16

^{7/}New York Times, May 28, 1960; from report of address before N.A.A.C.P. organization meeting.

2. that unions devote more attention to drives among Negroes, for registration and voting;
3. that Negroes be represented on union policy boards on all levels, and in higher elective and appointive positions;
4. that Negro union members be recognized in the selection of delegates to national and international conventions.

I think it should be noted that each of these proposals is in direct support of my earlier comment, relating to the fears and experiences of those Negroes who defend separate Negro locals, to the effect that complete loss of racial leaders and spokesmen is the too frequently-proven, ultimate cost of integration with white locals.

I, then, would add my own proposals to those of persons much more knowledgeable in labor union affairs whose proposals I second. First, I would expand upon the suggestions of both of these authorities, relating to educational activities. There is nowhere nearly enough understanding of the nature, causes and costs of, and remedies for, Prejudice and Discrimination. All labor men, black and white, should be exposed to teachings on this subject as a basic part of union indoctrination. This is one of the most misunderstood subjects in American life, despite the fact that every American considers himself to be an expert on the subject. The Commission on Labor-Management Organizations of the National Conference of Christians and Jews, of which I am a part, is devoting nation-wide effort to the extension of this purposeful kind of educational experience.

Secondly, I believe with Fleischman, that the threat of expulsion of a union which countenances practices of discrimination, is not an adequate answer. My counter-proposal may be considered naive and impractical; namely that each officer found guilty of fostering discriminatory practices be subject to penalties up to and including expulsion, but I seriously suggest that the individual claiming leadership honors and privileges, should also bear the responsibilities of leadership or have those honors and privileges withdrawn. It has been made much too easy for a defecting official to exploit the loyalty of his membership in defending his own unworthiness.

The preservation of democracy, whether in civic affairs or in union practices, need not countenance nor encourage the abdication of leadership responsibility or official morality. The fixing of personal penalties often has magic powers in the altering of organization practices.

Finally, I believe that next to the minorities themselves, labor unions have the greatest stake in the adoption of Fair Employment Practices legislation. As implied in the proposals of both Randolph and Fleishman, local union practices in the selection of office staff, officers, boards and delegations, are the first steps toward indoctrination of the membership, and in implementation of complete democracy in employment practices wherever that membership may be employed. Union support of FEPC legislation programs must be more than sloganeering; slogans without purposeful action are the refuge of cynics and misguided people. An important part of this proposal, too, is that Unions and union members use the legal tool freely in state where FEPC laws exist, and in firms holding Federal Government contracts. Administrators of the law cannot see everything, everywhere. They need the eyes and interests of all of you if they are to find and deal with hidden discriminatory practices in your town, in your plant.

My closing note was supplied me by the editorial column of the New York Times of Monday, June 6th, as I was attempting to bring this paper to a close. Summing up in very effective manner, what I have been trying to say, the Times commented:

"The Detroit convention of the newly formed Negro American Labor Council was striking evidence of a sort of civil rights rebellion within the labor movement. It is the product of the same dissatisfaction of Negroes over slow motion in putting equal rights principles into practice that caused the Southern sit-in demonstrations, and of the rising determination of Negroes to fight their own battle for their rights.

"There can be no doubt about the principles of organized labor. The constitution of the AFL-CIO outlaws racial discrimination. So do the constitutions of almost all of its affiliated unions, as well as those outside. And the federation has a Civil Rights Committee charged with the investigation of violations and with action to put a stop to them. In spite of all this there are still Jim Crow locals in the North as well as the South, membership restrictions that in effect bar Negroes

from jobs, a freeze-out of Negroes in labor apprenticeship and training programs and relatively few Negroes in important union offices.

"The new council hopes to recruit a majority of the one-and-a-quarter million Negro union members and, both directly and through local branches, to fight for emancipation from these handicaps. It will also encourage Negroes to take a more active part in local union affairs. These objectives are fine, but reaching for them this way involves dangers for the labor movement - even for labor-management relations."

The closing paragraph of Ginsberg's THE NEGRO POTENTIAL provides for us this

8/
final note:

"For hundreds of years the private conscience and the public morality of America have been weakened by the guilt we have carried over our treatment of the Negro. Ninety years ago we expended a great treasure to expiate this guilt.....For generations we have continued to live with this guilt, doing a little from time to time to assuage our consciences.....The greater challenge that now faces us as a leader of the free world has at last forced us to recall and to act upon Lincoln's warning: 'Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves, and, under a just God, cannot long retain it'."

2 op at 138

Harold A. Lett, Assistant Director
Commission on Labor-Management Organizations
National Conference of Christians and Jews
735 Southern Building
Washington 5, D. C.

June 10, 1960

8/op att. P. 38